

REMARKS

Applicant canceled claims 15 and 16.

Additionally, applicant amended allowed independent claim 23 to recite that the transparent layer interconnecting the second electrical contact is made of a "conductive material" rather than "light-conducting material" as was erroneously recited in claim 23. Applicant notes that a similar error was corrected in applicant's Amendment in Reply to Final Action of February 22, 2006, where applicant included the feature pertaining to "conductive material" in independent claim 1. Applicant similarly amended claim 23 to replace "light-conducting" with "conductive", and amended claim 25 to replace "conducting" with "conductive."

As applicant further explained in applicant's Amendment in Reply to Final Action of February 22, 2006, that the interconnecting material is a conductive material is described, for example, at the last paragraph on page 4 of the originally filed application, where it is stated that:

**The second contact layer can be realized as either continuous or discontinuous; in the latter case, the discontinuous portions are interconnected by a layer of transparent, conductive material, for example, indium-tin oxide (ITO).**

The first paragraph on page 8 of the originally filed application also describes the second contact layer. Applicant further notes that to the extent that the interconnecting layer is transparent, it also conducts light (i.e., it is an inherent feature of the transparent interconnecting layer that it conducts light).

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims.

Please apply any charges to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept. 7, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ido Rabinovitch  
Reg. No. L0080